

Withdrawal of finality

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive (see interview summary 5/12/09) and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/16/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, on page 7 (first paragraph of remarks) applicant argues that, the recited PD signature requires dragging and/or clicking on icons positioned on a background. In contrast, Zank fails to disclose an icon positioned on a background, much less dragging and/or clicking an icon to create a signature.

Examiner respectfully disagree with applicant, the cited features (dragging and/or clicking on icons positioned on a background or an icon positioned on a background) is not a claim language. Further Zank teaches the limitations in claim 1.

Regarding claim 1, on page 7 (second paragraph of remarks) applicant argues that, simply writing a signature cannot reasonably be construed as an "object," in the context of the claim. Also, as known in the art, Zank's pen tablet would not satisfy a "background image." Moreover, at the Examiner's citation, Zank discloses a step of "receiving data," not "providing data," i.e., Zank's

Art Unit: 2624

computer 12 receives data from pent tablet 24. For at least these reasons, the rejection of record should be withdrawn.

Examiner respectfully disagree with applicant, signature 25 in Fig.1 is an object, which corresponds to an electronic signature, see Abstract graphic tablet digitizer for signaling position coordinates of a stylus being moved to produce a handwritten signature. Examiner interprets that surface of graphic tablet digitizer 24 in Fig.1 refers to background and moving the stylus which corresponds to producing a signature corresponds to providing data for positioning at least one object on said background image (Fig.1 element 26 col.5 lines 20-30).

Regarding claim 17, on page 7 (third paragraph of remarks) applicants argue that Zank's signature simply includes "pen position coordinates such as x-, y-, and z-axis data." See Zank at col. 5 lines 28-32. In no event does Zank describe manipulating icons positioned on a background to generate a PD signature, as set forth in the claims. Clearly, the notion of icons are wholly absent from Zank's signature. For at least this reason, the rejection of record should be withdrawn.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant the cited features (to draw lines or reposition or click on one or more icons positioned on a background) are newly amended features. However the newly cited prior art of Suchard et al. (US 6,985,610) teaches drawing lines or reposition (col.6 lines 49-56).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding the rejection of claims 5, 11, 13 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. 103;
Zank In view Of Microsoft Operating System.

Regarding claims 5, 11, 13 and 14, on page 10 (second paragraph of remarks) applicant argues "As an initial matter, Applicant points out that the Examiner must provide explicit analysis supporting any rationale why a person skilled in the art would combine the prior art to arrive at the claimed invention, KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S., 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007). Here, the Examiner merely provides the statement that the modification would have been obvious to access an application in a short time. This is nothing more than an assertion that the claimed combination of elements was obvious to try. Although the Court has held that showing that a combination of elements was obvious to try can be proper where there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, see KSR Int'l Co., 82 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1390, the Examiner has not shown a design need or market pressure to solve a problem or that there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions. Thus, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden to initially establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, see In re Peehs, 204 U.S.P.Q. 835,837 (CCPA 1980)".

Examiner respectfully disagree with applicant operating pointing device includes positioning a drag-able icon and sampling a drag and drop or a click mode is well known in the art (i.e., Widow 95 or Window 2000 or Window XP of Microsoft operating system). However since applicant argues that, Examiner has

Art Unit: 2624

failed to meet the burden to initially establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, see *In re Peehs*, 204 U.S.P.Q. 835,837 (CCPA 1980)".

Examiner provides the prior art references for rejection of claims 5, 11, 13 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. 103; Zank in view of Schindler et al. (US 6,516,467).

Please see prior art of Schindler in col.6 lines 34-45 for dragging and dropping icons also col.15 lines 60-65 for Microsoft Window 95, also see col.19 lines 34-48 for Microsoft Window 95).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 6-12, 15-18 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zank et al. (US 6,307,955).

Zank discloses for providing data (Fig.1 element 25 col.5 lines 20-30) for the display of a background image (Fig.1 element 24 col.5 lines 20-30), providing data for positioning at least one object on said background image (Fig.1 element 26 col.5 lines 20-30), receiving a sampled pointing device (PD) signature including a set of position vectors(Fig.1 element 25 col.5 lines 20-30), said PD signature generated by sampling a plurality of events corresponding to positions of a cursor (col.6 lines 1-5) while operating said pointing device to

Art Unit: 2624

provide data relative to said background image(Fig.1 element 25 col.5 lines 20-30),

Comparing said sampled PD signature to a stored PD signature representing the identity of the user (Fig.4 see 25A and 25B, col.8 lines 22-32), and

Validating said identity of said user in response to said comparing step (col.8 lines 22-32).

Regarding claim 2 Zank provides for moving said PD manipulates said cursor on said background image (Fig.1 element 26).

Regarding claim 6 Zank provides sampling of a plurality of events includes sampling a time component (col.5 lines 59-62, see sampling intervals).

Regarding claim 7 Zank provides for the step of comparing includes applying a set of nodes to analyze said sample signature and determining if said sample signature satisfies a threshold matching criteria (Fig.3 element 66 col.8 lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 8 Zank provides for the steps of." receiving a plurality of signature exemplars (col.2 lines 23-25, see receiving a multiplicity of the coordinates) ; and creating a set of nodes associated with said exemplars(col.2 lines 25-28, see storing respective sets of the coordinates in sequential order as an electronic signature while preserving a time relation between coordinates).

Regarding claim 10 Zank provides for operating said pointing device includes positioning said cursor relative to said objects (Fig.4 element 72).

Regarding claim 15 Zank provides for the PD signature is generated by processing said set of position vectors including processing a series of said events using a plurality of nodes (col.5 line 65-col.6 line 8).

Regarding claim 16 Zank provides for receiving a verification request from a provider (col.10 lines 28-40); and
Issuing in response to said step of validating, an authorization message to said provider (col.10 lines 28-40).

Regarding claim 49 Zank provides for the display of a background image includes downloading a virtual pad consisting of said background image (Fig.1 element 24) and said object (Fig.1 element 25).

Regarding claim 50 Zank provides repositioning objects (col.6 lines 1-5) on said background image (Fig.1 element 24) and said object to create said PD signature (Fig.1 element 25).

Regarding claim 51 Zank provides for displaying said background image on a computer display screen (Fig.1 element 16).

Regarding claim 12 Zank provides for step of sampling a plurality of events includes sampling horizontal and vertical positions of said cursor (col.2 lines 15-20) and a time parameter associated with respective ones of said events (col.2 lines 15-20, see clock circuit), also see col.5 lines 30-25, see x-,y-, and z-z-axis data to the computer 12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4, 17-19 and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zank et al. (US 6,307,955) in view of Suchard et al. (US 6,985,610).

Regarding claims 3 and 19 Zank does not provide for operating said PD includes moving a mouse. Suchard teaches for operating PD includes moving a mouse (col.6 lines 49-56, also see Fig.3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Suchard with the system and the method of Zank, to recognize and authenticate signature in high dimensional space. See technical field of the invention.

Regarding claims 4 and 18, see the rejection of claim 3. They recite similar limitation as claim 3. Hence they are similarly analyzed and rejected.

Regarding claim 17 Zank provides for software system stored on a computer readable medium (col.6 lines 20-25) for validating a user's identity comprising software configured to perform the steps of:

providing data for the display of an object map to a user ((Fig.4 see 25A and 25B, col.8 lines 22-32),; receiving data representing signature characteristics

Art Unit: 2624

generated by processing a set of position vectors resulting from user manipulation of a cursor to draw lines or reposition or click on one or more icons positioned on a background ((Fig.1 element 25 col.5 lines 20-30 Examiner interprets that surface of graphic tablet digitizer 24 in Fig.1 refers to background and moving the stylus which corresponds to producing a signature corresponds to providing data for positioning at least one object on said background image) , using an input device to provide a sample of a plurality of events corresponding to positions of said cursor so as to further provide a sampled signature including said set of position vectors (Fig.1 element 25 col.5 lines 20-30) ; comparing said signature characteristics to characteristics of a stored signature representing the user's identity (Fig.4 see 25A and 25B, col.8 lines 22-32); validating said user's identity in response to said comparing step (col.8 lines 22-23).

Zank does not provide for manipulation of a cursor to draw lines by a mouse. In the same field of endeavor Suchard teaches manipulation of a cursor (mouse) for drawing lines (col.6 lines 49-56, also see Fig.3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Suchard with the system and the method of Zank, to recognize and authenticate signature in high dimensional space. See technical field of the invention.

Regarding claim 33 Zank provides for a user computer system having a pointing device(Fig.1 element 18 col.5 lines 18-30) and a display screen (Fig.1 element 16), the user computer system operational to (i) display a virtual pad (

Art Unit: 2624

Fig.1 element 24) on said display screen, (ii) respond to a positioning of said pointing device to position a cursor on said virtual pad (Fig.1 element 18), and (iii) provide a collection of vectors describing an operation of said pointing device with respect to said cursor (Fig.1 element 25); said verification server comprising: an interface in communication with said user computer system for receiving said collection of vectors (Fig.1 element 22 see equip. interface) associated with drawing lines or the reposition or click on one or more icon positioned on a background, a signature recognition engine (Fig.4) configured to (i) process said vectors (Fig.4 elements 25A and 25B), (ii) compare said processed vectors to exemplar signature data (Fig.4 see comparison of 25A and 25B col.8 lines 22-32) and, in response, (iii) provide signature recognition data (col.8 lines 22-32). Zank does not provide for manipulation of a cursor to draw lines by a mouse. In the same field of endeavor Suchard teaches manipulation of a cursor (mouse) for drawing lines (col.6 lines 49-56, also see Fig.3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Suchard with the system and the method of Zank, to recognize and authenticate signature in high dimensional space. See technical field of the invention.

Claims 5 ,9,11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zank Zank et al. (US 6,307,955) in view of Schindler et al.(Us 6,516,467).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 5,11 and 13-14 Zank does not provide for a sampling of a plurality of events includes a drag and drop event by pointing device, and sampling a mode, wherein sampling a mode of input device includes a step of sampling a normal mode, a "drag and drop" mode, or a click mode of said input device. In the same field of endeavor Schindler teaches the above limitations (col.6 lines 34-45). it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schindler with the system and the method of Zank , to control one or more cursors displayed on the monitor as par of a graphical user interface by dragging and dropping cells onto the icons which provide factions such as picture, video clip, see col.6 lines 34-46.

Regarding claim 9 Zank does not provide for displaying said background image includes displaying a graphic. In the same field of endeavor Schindler teaches displaying a graphic as a background image (col.6 lines 34-45). it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schindler with the system and the method of Zank , to control one or more cursors displayed on the monitor as par of a graphical user interface by dragging and dropping cells onto the icons which provide factions such as picture, video clip, see col.6 lines 34-46.

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zank et al. (US 6,307,955) in view of Suchard et al.(US 6,985,610), further in view of Schindler et al.(Us 6,516,467).

Regarding claim 52 Zank as modified by Suchard does not provide for the step of displaying includes displaying a background image and an icon on a computer display screen. Schindler teaches displaying includes displaying a background image and an icon on a computer display ((col.6 lines 34-45). it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schindler with the system and the method of Zank as modified by Suchard , to control one or more cursors displayed on the monitor as par of a graphical user interface by dragging and dropping cells onto the icons which provide factions such as picture, video clip, see col.6 lines 34-46.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALI BAYAT whose telephone number is (571)272-7444. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VIKKRAM BALI can be reached on 571-272-7415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ali Bayat/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624
5/27/09

/Vikkram Bali/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624